

Wm. L. Smith

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

One dollar per annum.]

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."—Paul.

[Payable in advance]

VOL. VI.]

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1826.

[No. 8.]

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

LETTER NO. II.

To a Young Universalist Preacher.

My dear friend—In my preceding communication, I stated my views of the feelings with which a christian minister ought to be actuated, in engaging in the labors of his vocation; and I endeavored to show what value he should place on those subordinate attainments, which are so much courted by most preachers, especially by the young. To the observations which have been made, I may add, that to form, and preserve a style of speaking, or to adopt and employ a kind of language, which shall hold a due medium between bombast, on the one hand, and a low, disgusting phraseology, on the other, is an object worthy the attention of every public teacher.—These are extremes that ought to be equally avoided. The first does not constitute eloquence; and the last has no connexion with true simplicity. Our words should be well chosen, and be expressive of the idea we mean to communicate. That plainness of speech, for which the Apostles were distinguished, does not require, that we should offend against the rules of grammar, or employ either words or similes, which are calculated to produce levity or contempt. The beautiful simplicity of religion certainly does not render it a grovelling subject. There is nothing in it contrary to a delicate and refined taste. And as to levity, which, I am sorry to say, some preachers appear willing to excite in their hearers, nothing strikes me as more improper, or more at variance with the purposes and objects of the gospel; nothing more distant from the examples of those inspired men, some of whose discourses have come down to us through the medium of the scriptures. The public discourses of our Lord, of Peter and Paul, which are on record in the New Testament, were plain, and cuttingly reprehensive; they struck both at the doctrines and practices of their hearers; but we find nothing in them, that we can suppose could have excited levity, or have even provoked a smile. Those preachers did not address their hearers to amuse them, but to expose the vileness of their characters, to warn them of their danger, to exhort them to repentance, and to produce on them a genuine reformation.

Though it will be shown, more particularly, hereafter, that the gospel is, of all concerns, the most serious, yet I make the above remarks from a conviction, that young preachers are generally much inclined to adopt a manner, which they

consider TAKING, or one, that will captivate attention; and in securing this object, it is to be feared, that they may not always be very nice or discriminating in the means by which they expect to secure the end they have in view. Thus, if a preacher possesses a sportive wit; if he can relate an anecdote with a good grace; or if he has a satirical humor, and thinks he can exercise it to advantage on the opinions or practices of others, whose creeds differ from his own, he will probably indulge the natural bias of his mind, and plead in its extenuation, that he does it to gain public attention to the doctrine which he supports. This is to hold up, that the end sanctifies the means. But he does not consider, that merely the circumstance, that his meetings are numerous attended, is no substantial evidence of the spread of truth; that there are always those, who have little or no religion, and care little or nothing about any, who will sit very contentedly for hours, to hear what amuses their minds, and tickles a morbid imagination; that the giddy and thoughtless, who divert themselves with the unseasonable wit, or unjustifiable sarcasm of a preacher, will almost certainly lose the moral sentiment, which he alleges he means to communicate, in the dazzling form in which he envelopes it; and finally, that all the followers that a minister may gain, and all the converts that he may make by such means, add no strength to the cause of religion, nor reflect any honor on the gospel of Christ.

If those, who experience so high a pleasure in attending on discourses of the character I have just described, were to hear only the moral or evangelical truths which are so forcibly inculcated in the scriptures, and which are there addressed to our most serious feelings, it is to be feared they would soon lose their relish for preaching, unless they acquired a more correct taste. Indeed, if the preachers, whom they extol for the manner of their communications, would divest them of those forms which are so captivating to high minds, and address themselves to the lovers of wit and satire, with the solemnity which the gospel demands, such hearers would soon complain of their services, as stale, insipid, and unworthy their attention. Finding no longer the same source of amusement, they would give but little attention to any higher object; and in their disappointment, they might feel inclined to charge the preacher with the absurdities of orthodoxy, and the rigidity of puritanism.

Yours most sincerely,

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

ON INSPIRATION....NO. III.

He that takes away *reason*, to make way for *revelation*, puts out the light of both, and does very much the same as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote lights of an invisible star by a telescope.

Locke.

I wish to have distinctly remembered, what I dare say no impartial and attentive reader has forgotten, that I admit and contend the Bible to have been written by *divine inspiration*. I only deny the correctness of the construction put upon *that idea*. Divine inspiration, when properly understood, does not imply an interview, either directly or indirectly, or a special communication of God with man;—Though if it did imply even that much, it must be evident, *from a comparison of the principles of the Old, with the principles of the New Testament*, that the former are opposed to the latter root and branch, and that, *therefore*, the former cannot be supposed to have been thus communicated to man, if the latter were. I did say, in the latter part of my first number upon this subject, that “there is no necessity, and never was, of a personal interview, or communication between God and man, in the sense which has been attached to the inspirations of Moses,” and the reason *why* is, the wisdom of the almighty Creator of the universe devised a far more efficient and authenticated mode of informing mankind respecting his character and attributes, than that of communicating with them by a *tete-a-tete* with an individual. I can explain this last position more satisfactorily, if circumstances should render it convenient. I am aware that it may have been suggested to the mind of him who clings with superstitious reverence to the idea which I oppose, and be considered at first, as an explicit and conclusive testimony against all which I have been saying, that the Bible says, *Moses talked with the Lord* “FACE TO FACE.” But in adverting to this supposed evidence of a *special, personal interview* of God with man, I am happy in believing that it will give me a fair opportunity of shewing how essential *REASON* is to a right understanding of what is termed *revelation*, (which is but another name for *divine inspirations*;) and of testing the correctness of the construction which I put upon the *nature* of divine inspirations, by adducing another piece of testimony, which must be considered as of equally high authority as any thing which can be brought from the Bible. I allude to the assertion of St. John, which is once, if not oftener, repeated in the New Testament, that “NO MAN HATH SEEN GOD AT ANY TIME.” I may here be allowed to digress so far as to observe, that,

Reason must necessarily be called to aid revelation, when revelation would otherwise become inconsistent with itself. When the writings of two persons, each of whom is reputed to have

been inspired to write by Deity in a special and peculiar manner, seem to contradict each other most obviously, if taken in their literal senses, this contradiction proves to our *reason*, that one or the other of the two writings is metaphorical, or that one of them only is genuine. Admitting both to be the writings of genuine inspiration, then *that one* must be considered as metaphorical which will best bear the construction of a metaphor.—This course is unavoidable, if we would make both to be revelations. So long as they seem to contradict each other, so long one of the two must be considered as not properly understood, and consequently cannot be a revelation. For until a thing is understood, it is not a revelation, because to reveal a thing is to make it understood. Hence a metaphor cannot be a revelation, until it is properly understood; and to understand a metaphor, it is obvious that recourse must be had to *reason*.

In bringing the two assertions of Moses and John in contrast, it is obvious that a grand question, which must determine the correctness or the falsity of my views respecting the nature of divine inspirations, or what constitutes divine inspirations, arises, viz. which of the two writings must yield up its *literal sense* to the *literal sense* of the other? If the assertion of Moses cannot be so *reasonably* considered as metaphorical, as the assertion of John, which flatly contradicts it may, then I admit that divine inspiration is proved to mean a personal interview or special communication of God with man, and that the idea which I have advanced is chimerical. But on the other hand, if John's assertion cannot be so *reasonably* considered as metaphorical, as the assertion of Moses, which it flatly contradicts may, then, I believe, it must be admitted that *Moses did not see God face to face* as he had seen his brother Aaron and other personages, and that *no man hath seen God at any time*; and consequently, that divine inspiration means no more than *natural effects* produced in the human mind, by a serious contemplation of divine objects and the works of Deity;—and consequently, that the old idea respecting the nature and solemnity of divine inspirations is chimerical. It cannot but be forcibly remarked, how indispensable *reason* becomes in the present instance. But to proceed,

Human ingenuity cannot pervert the assertion of John into a metaphor, or into any other sense than the one which it expresses. Wherefore, if it be taken for any thing, it must be taken absolutely, and consequently the assertion of Moses must either be susceptible of some other than its literal meaning, in order to make the two harmonize, or it must be abandoned as inconsistent with the truth.

But Moses' assertion may be metamorphosed

into perfect harmony with John's, which is already in complete concert with the one I advocate, viz. *God never did communicate with man*,—"No man hath seen God at any time." If any man hath seen God in the literal sense of Moses' assertion, it must have been since the days of John, for up to his time no man had seen him, though Moses' time was long previously. Still, in a figurative sense, in a metaphorical sense, Moses may be said to have seen God face to face, and such a sense is not contradicted by John's assertion, without the latter is purposely construed so. Suffice it to say, it need not be so construed, and unless it is, the two sayings may be made to harmonize.

Moses may very properly be said to have seen the Lord's face in the same way as David in the 17th Psalm, v. 15, is said to have pledged himself to see the Lord's "face," that is, "in righteousness," and in the same sense that David always saw the Lord before his own face, i. e. "face to face," as spoken of in Acts, ch. ii. v. 25. It is evident, that David saw God *only in his contemplations*—he saw the "face" of the Lord "in righteousness," by observing how beautifully sublime and easy every thing good and harmonious appeared, contradicting their counterparts. He meditated so intensely upon what he saw, heard and experienced, in the heavens, the earth, the waters, and all creation, that he could not but come to the conclusion that an all-wise and omnipotent being controlled and ruled over the universe, and had established the principles which were daily discovered to him, and in those discoveries could not but discover the *features* and vestiges of that being, the *face* of his God, in the same sense as we see in a portrait the features and face of our friend. Ideas are to the mind precisely the same, whether they be portrayed in figures, put, as it were, into a tangible shape, or not. An idea is as legible to the mind, before it is written upon paper, as afterwards. Ideas are to the mind what paintings are to the eye, *representations of objects*. Principles are ideas, or portraits to the mind. Moses imagined that he saw God portrayed in the principles of that system of morality which he inculcated, because it appeared to him to be *perfection itself*, and consequently the image, the portrait, yes, the "face" of the Lord. Upon the supposition of its being perfect, he declared it to be the word of God, meaning that it was conformable to the will of God, and those principles which God must approve of in man; and being in power, he imposed it upon his subjects, or all over whom he had influence, as the laws and in the name of Deity, in the same way and with the same authority, as we say at this day, such and such a principle is natural law—meaning that it is a law enacted by God for man's strict observance. Moses spoke of the Lord, when he meant *only Na-*

ture; we speak *only of nature*, when we mean God, or the Lord. This difference exists only in words and the mode of expression.

Without putting the foregoing construction upon Moses' assertion, it cannot be made to agree with St. John's writings; divine inspirations will not harmonize, but CONTRADICT EACH OTHER, and neither of the two writers can be understood without destroying the other. And if such a construction must necessarily be put upon it, in order to understand St. John's declaration, then the idea which I advanced is clearly proved, without one additional word upon the subject.

THEOPHILANTHROPIST.

P. S.—Mr. Streeter, The "Christian Telescope" of Sept. 2, (an Universalist paper published in Providence, R. I.) has fallen into my hands, containing a communication over the signature "A Believer in Divine Revelation," addressed to you, and, as I regret, assailing you in a very authoritative and inquisitorial tone, on account of my communication in your paper of the 19th ult. The writer professes to have been *inspired*, or, in other words, to have been urged on to write his address by the *intensity* of the "moral interest" which he says he feels "in the prosperity and spread of revealed religion;" and, from the intensity of this "moral interest" which he professes to feel, he could not, as it seems, refrain from expressing, in his own way, the regret which he felt at seeing published in your paper a communication which he discovers to be "a blow aimed with deadly intention at the very root of the whole system of revealed religion," without having its "incorrectness" pointed out by you. Here, suffer me to say to this intense, morally interested "Believer," in the language of the New-Testament, "Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest, doest the same things."

If it would have been premature in the Editor of this paper, (and certainly it would) to have interrupted me before I had finished half of my story, then certainly it would be more so for another person to do it. But this intense "Believer" has done so by a side thrust, though he has not touched one principle of my arguments. The chief cause of his complaint, is, on the grounds that the communication was admitted into a universalist periodical without the editor's pointing out the *incorrectness* of its arguments. Now this very intense "Believer" has copied into his universalist periodical parts of the same writing, or what he acknowledges to be the "leading features" of my communication, and "spread" it before his readers, as if to inculcate its truths in a negative way, *without making one solitary attempt to refute any part of it, or to point out its incorrectness*, if we except one reserved intimation of Moses' having,

seen the Lord face to face. Is it not evident therefore that he has done in this, the very same act which he reprobates, and professes to abhor with the "intense moral interest" of an orthodox bigot? Let him revolve this query for a moment, and expect to hear shortly from one whom he has charged with aiming "a blow with *deadly intention* at the very root of the whole system of revealed religion." T.

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

LETTERS TO PARENTS, NO. 2.

KIND PARENTS—In resuming the subject of these letters, I must again allude to the many severe trials which I formerly experienced, in not being able to bring my mind and heart into a worshipping frame and feeling, when He, whom I now adore and love and serve as my heavenly Father, was represented [or rather *mis-represented*] as a passionate, changeful tyrant. Presuming, from time to time, that the fault was my own, no exertions were spared to produce submission to the requirements from the pulpit. Hundreds of times have I prostrated myself before the "Great Unknown," and begged in spiritual agony, that my obdurate heart might be subdued and changed, and the character of my God and Redeemer, become acceptable to my affections.—But the more I sought and prayed, the less beautiful and venerable was the object of contemplation. At length I made bold to reveal my insufferable troubles to an amiable, female companion, who was a professor of religion. She listened to my story, with breathless solicitude, her eyes floating in tears; and when I paused, caught my hand with affectionate energy, exclaiming in heart-touching tenderness—"Why, my dear Emily! you are under conviction." She advised me at once to send for a minister, that he might converse and pray with me, and thereby remove the obstacles which prevented a compliance with the terms of salvation. After offering several objections to the proposal, which were instantly disposed of, I reluctantly consented. Then, dear Parents, as you may well suppose, my fears and mental sufferings, were exquisite—they were unutterable. But before my spiritual guide came in, I had an opportunity of conversing with considerable freedom, with my agreeable and accomplished friend. She assured me that *her* former trials and convictions accorded perfectly with *mine*, excepting that she would not have been able, at the time, to assign the distinct reasons for her unsubmission to the mild terms of the Gospel.

Having withdrawn, for a few moments' private meditation, I was soon called, and on entering the room, was met by the Reverend Divine, whose presence had been solicited! Merciful Lord! thought I, what shall I say or do? My heart fluttered and bounded, as though determined to es-

cape from imprisonment. Oh! it was an interesting moment of my existence; to be forgotten only in the oblivion of all that is past. Absorbed in tears, with my face mantled in my handkerchief, I bowed my sorrow-smitten heart before the inconceivable Power, whose nature I did not then understand.

Immediately the inquisition commenced. The eyes of the preacher were fastened upon me; his questions were proposed in a hollow, mournful voice. Being unable to answer him audibly, owing principally to my affright, he listened a few moments, to the imperfect recital of what I had previously said to his young convert, when he pronounced me "under deep and awful conviction," expressing a fervent hope, that it was the commencement of "powerful Revival," in his parish. He said it had been strongly impressed on his mind, for several weeks past, and confirmed by a remarkable *dream*, which he triumphantly related, that a powerful work of Grace was about to be realized.

Again turning his attention to me, he asked, what assistance I expected through his instrumentality. Having become sufficiently collected, to answer him distinctly, I told the Rev. preacher that, although I had repeatedly and patiently *tried* to love and worship the character which he, and other clergymen, ascribed to the Deity, yet I could not do it; and was afraid his assertions were true, that the fault was to be found in the depravity of my own heart. But, to my inexpressible surprise, instead of attempting the removal of such objections to his views of God's feelings towards his offspring, he accused me of every degree of wickedness and ill-desert, which language could express. A spectator, who should have credited his description, would have classed me with the Furies of Pandemonium. His whole appearance was instantly changed. Instead of that winning gentleness with which he first addressed me, his eye kindled into flames—his voice was as thunder; and all his movements violent. Never, no never, kind guardians of my infancy and childhood, did I before, or have I since, endured such a storm of denunciations. He said, my heart was hard as adamant; but God's word was as a hammer to break the flinty rock in pieces;—and he was determined to beat upon it, till it was shivered to atoms, and humbled, unless it bid defiance, both to human and Divine efforts. The zealous man gave me no opportunity for inquiries or reply; and even caused the tears to shoot copiously from the eyes of my dear friend, by whose solicitation he was present.


But as I have not room to give you the sequel of this interview, I must defer the remainder till my next; remaining, as ever,

Your dutiful, &c.

DAUGHTER.

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

PORTLAND.....SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1826

 *For reasons which we have not room to state, our paper will be issued again next Saturday. Correspondents who are furnishing us with articles in a series of numbers, and wish them published regularly, will govern themselves accordingly.*

"CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE."

The EDITOR of the CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER does not acknowledge any debt of gratitude to the Editors of the (Providence) "Telescope and Miscellany," for their notice of his communication sent to them in reply to a "Believer in Divine Revelation." The "two reasons" which they assign for not publishing our article, bring no conviction to our mind, that the *Telescope* is "edited by an Association of Gentlemen."

Reason 1st. "It (the reply alluded to) contains nothing which would be interesting to our readers."

Quite a compliment! But *why* would it not "be interesting to" their readers? Are they not interested in the truth? It had been inferred that our correspondent *Theophilanthropist* "aimed a deadly blow at the system of divine revelation," and we assured the writer (and the public) that he was wholly mistaken; that "*Theophilanthropist*" did *not* mean to oppose, &c. but simply disagreed with some others concerning the real meaning, of the term "divine inspiration." But the editors of the "*Telescope*" appear to maintain, that their readers have an interest in remaining under a totally wrong, yea, false impression, but have *no interest in knowing the truth!*

We do not believe that their readers would justify the conduct of the editors, if they knew the *facts* of the case; but, provided they would, might we not hope the publication of the reply, would be for the interest in another respect, by showing them, that *civilization* should *precede* revelation! Or that newspaper scribblers should be governed by the rules of common *civility*.

Reason 2d. "We are fully persuaded from an acquaintance with the general character of the Editor from whom it was received, that after a little time for reflection, he will derive a pleasure from the knowledge that it was not given to the public."

Well done, doctors! what next? Give us more of your *edgeless* wit and *pointless* sarcasm. But what is the import of the above quotation? Why, he who is learned, even in the alphabet of common sense, cannot fail to discover its meaning. It is, that "the Editor," (*our humble self*), wrote without a moment's reflection; and that after a little consideration, we shall look up and bless our stars, that our sapient, guardian friends, did not expose us to public ridicule! Yes, and this must be understood as our "general character"!! Another proof that we should place great reliance on the *kindnesses* of "*Providence*."

This wholly gratuitous, unsolicited, and unacceptable favor, reminds us of the story of the kind, inoffensive *Quaker*. Being offended with his *dog*, he could not conscientiously injure him. Said he, "I will not hurt thee *Tray*, but I will give thee a bad name." Accordingly, he went into the street, crying out "*mad dog! mad dog!*" The reader knows the result—poor *Tray* was destroyed, and the tender-hearted *Quaker* went off with unstained hands.

As to the whining apology of "*a Believer in Revelation*," that he would not have obtruded himself upon public notice, under the pretence of teaching the Editor of the *Ch. Intelligencer*, how to conduct a religious paper, "*if we had intimated in the first No.*" &c. we can only say, it is making a bad matter, immeasurably worse! It implies, that we were either too *weak* or too *wicked*, to expose what he calls "*Deistical sentiments!*"

But to act on the maxim, "*thrice arm'd is he who hath his quarrel just*," we state, *distinctly*, that we suspect the Editors of the *Telescope* are *merely nominal*; and that the paper is conducted, mainly, by an inexperienced, beardless youth. On any other supposition we could not excuse the very exceptionable and censurable course which has been pursued in relation to this unpleasant subject.

"JUDGE YE," WHICH IS IN THE RIGHT.

The following manly effort to rebut a groundless report, would undoubtedly be approved by our readers. We are sorry to expose the character of Capt. Pratt, but the truth ought and must be told.

Mr. Streeter—It becomes my painful duty to send you for publication, for the information of the public, the account of a story which has been circulated in this town, to the dissatisfaction of many. Capt. JOEL PRATT, of Foxcroft, who is a Calvinist professor, and who, I have been informed, has been a Deacon of the church in that place, resided some months last season in this town, and visited my father in his last sickness, who for more than twenty years had been a believer in Universalism. On Capt. Pratt's return to Foxcroft, and when assembled in prayer meeting with his brethren, he gave the following account of my father's changing his principles.—My informant writes thus: "I was present at a prayer meeting of the Congregationalists in Foxcroft, last fall, where Capt. Joel Pratt arose, and after a few preliminary remarks said, he thought it would be useful to relate the circumstances of a Universalist's changing his sentiments on a sick bed. He said that in the town of *Eddington*, where he had been at work the summer past, there resided an aged General," (my father,) "who had long been afflicted with an incurable disease, and had then in all probability but a short time to live; to whom he had paid three visits. The first time he visited him, by conversing with him on the subject of religion, he found him a

firm, unwavering Universalist. The second time he perceived that he was a little wavering. And the third time he said he found that he had entirely changed his sentiments, had renounced his belief in the doctrine of Universal Salvation, and was ready to warn every one that came in his room against embracing and resting in the belief of that dangerous and deceiving doctrine, shewing them how it had led and deceived him almost to the brink of endless woe; and rejoiced and praised God for having, through grace divine, delivered him from that awful snare." My father did not, to my knowledge, or the knowledge of any of our family or neighbors, call upon any one that visited him, to renounce Universalism.—"Dangerous and deceiving doctrine." Yes, that doctrine which has the word of God for its support, is called by the pious Capt. "dangerous and deceiving."—"Awful snare." I should suppose by this expression that this godly man thinks, that a belief in Universal Salvation is the highest pitch of sin and wickedness that a man can attain to.

I have written twice to Capt. Pratt, upon this subject, and received one answer, in which he writes as follows:—"The third time I went into his room, he said in relation to himself, 'You see I am going into eternity!' I asked him if he was prepared to go; he answered 'No!' but said, 'I have lived a careless life all my days.' I then asked if he felt himself to be a sinner; he answered, 'Yes, a great sinner.' I then said, 'Christ is a great Saviour.' He said, 'I know that, and that salvation is ALL of God, but I have no hope.' About this time my son came into the room, and your father turned from me to him and warned him in a very spirited manner, not to do as he had done, lived all his days in sin and carelessness, and now going into eternity, and no hope of salvation. He says to him, 'Seek salvation while you are young, and not put it off as I have done.' I inferred from this, that I had good reason to say that he was shaken in his Universal plan; and actually said that he renounced Universalism."

In reply to the above, I have to say, that the way and manner for mankind to prepare themselves for salvation, I have yet to learn. God is able in his own time and way, to prepare all souls for himself in glory. I think it suitable and proper for all men to feel themselves sinners; for "all have sinned," and by no means inconsistent with Universalism, so far as I understand it.

"I have no hope." If my father ever said this, it was different from the general tenor of his mind; for he always appeared to have the strongest hope of salvation, not only for himself, but for all mankind. And no one that I know of ever heard him say any thing like this, except Capt.

Pratt. My mother and my eldest sister are both professors of the Calvinistic doctrine. My sister was at my house, and in the room, when Captain Pratt made his last visit to my father, and she says that she took particular notice of the conversation—and neither she nor my mother have any recollection of such talk as Capt. Pratt represents. Capt. Pratt did not mention the circumstance to any of our family, or any of our neighbors, or even in town, that I have heard of; but when he had returned to Foxcroft, he extolled to the clouds a wonderful conversion of a Universalist, which no one else knows any thing of. I have lived with my father for many years, and I never knew him wavering from the Abrahamic faith, though he lived three weeks after this interview with Capt. Pratt, and had his senses well until within three or four days of his death. I have only to add, that this relation of Capt. Pratt's looks a little like a Calvinist explaining the secret will of God.

CHARLES LEAVENS.

Eddington, August 30, 1826.

VISITATIONS.

To visit the sick and the dying, for the noble purpose of administering relief and consolation, is truly a christian duty. It is an humble imitation of the great Founder of our holy religion. But the conduct of certain Calvinistic professors, who watch every opportunity to enter the chamber of the dying, with no better motive than to subject them to an inquisitorial examination, as to their views concerning universal salvation, cannot be marked with too decided reprobation. Their officiousness is truly contemptible.—Who of us have not witnessed such hypocritical intrusions?

When a Universalist is supposed to be "sick unto death," he must admit into his presence all the religious inquisitors who may call, or he is denounced as an infamous infidel. And if he gratifies them, they improve the opportunity to the utmost to shake his faith in the Redeemer, and make him fear, that whether elect or reprobate, he is hanging over an endless hell by the strength of a hair. Yes, unaccountable to tell, there are too many of the self-styled orthodox, who make a boast, even in public journals, of having seen persons who were once Universalists, go out of the world in soul-torturing agony!

It appears to be their soul's delight to create fear, doubt, and mental anguish. This is too evident from the reluctance with which they leave a person, whose faith cannot be shaken. But, what is worse than all the rest, some of these sick-bed tormentors, will misrepresent, where they have been defeated in their mischievous design. Many instances of this character could be mentioned, if it were necessary. Though we have never known an instance, in more than fifteen years critical observation, in which a real believer in the Truth, was overcome by these pious intruders, yet, we do consider it a piece of ill-judged courtesy

to permit their visits, unless they will first consent to those usages, which are consistent with good manners and human kindness.

"THEO PHILANTHROPIST."

In relation to the articles published over the above named signature, we would barely remark, that they were inserted, with an express understanding that their views should be subject to fair examination or refutation, in our paper. Some of our *opposers* have alleged that the *Editor* wrote these, and palmed them upon the public, over a suspicious signature. We have only to reply, directly, and "without the least equivocation or mental reservation whatever," that such an insinuation is radically, totally and contemptibly *false*. The Editor of this paper had no agency or concern, in the writings of "Theophilanthropist." But knowing him to be a gentleman of respectability, and an avowed, practical friend of religion, we indulged him in publishing his *peculiar notions* concerning the meaning of "divine revelation." As yet, we have not had time to examine his arguments, so as to give him a fair and intelligible answer. If any of our correspondents should see fit to reply, we should be glad; but we ask for *argument*; not declamation. It will be of no avail, to call him a "*Deist*," unless it is first *proved*, that a Deist cannot tell the truth! It will not do for any one to state, from "the best of his recollection," that "*Tom Paine* taught the same doctrine." We never read but a *few* pages of Paine's writings and knew but little about them; and dare not, therefore, presume that he never reasoned correctly. Let our friends *prove*, that "Theophilanthropist" has *erred* concerning the difference between the Old and New Testaments, or the meaning of "divine revelation," and their arguments will appear in our columns as soon as possible.

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

SUBJECTS FOR ILLUSTRATION.

MR. EDITOR—I have been a reader of your valuable publication, ever since the commencement of the 3d volume, and can say with safety that I have read *nine-tenths* of the matter it has contained. And although I was at first suspicious that the bold and independent stand which you had taken, in opposition to error, hypocrisy, priestcraft and superstition, would prove injurious to the cause of truth, I am now fully satisfied that you were not premature in your decision, but that the course you have pursued has produced many beneficial effects. One thing which has contributed so essentially to the interest of your columns, is, the cheerfulness and courtesy with which you give insertion to articles of local and general intelligence—the communications of your numerous correspondents, and the solution of difficult questions, whether they relate to metaphysics or theology. With your permission, therefore, I will propose a few important subjects, for illustration in some future numbers of the "Intelligencer."

"You are requested to offer an explanation of Matt. xxv. 46.—2. Of the Rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi.—3. Of the Spirits in prison, 1st Peter, iii. 19. &c.—4. Of the fallen Angels and their punishment, Jude vi.

Should you condescend, Mr. Editor, to answer these enquiries, I shall feel myself much obliged; and I am con-

vinced that your papers would be more carefully read, and exert a more powerful influence over the minds of the reading community.

CANDOUR.

Hallowell, Sept. 1826.

AN HOUSE OF WORSHIP. Our friends in Readfield, in connexion with other denominations, have long been desirous of having a Meeting House in that beautiful village, called "Readfield Corner;" and we rejoice to hear that they have at last, come to the conclusion to build. The House is to be constructed somewhat like ours, in this place. May prosperity, health and peace attend the *builders, owners, and occupants* of that contemplated Temple of worship and praise.

REMOVAL. Our friend and Brother, Doct. *Alex. Hatch*, has removed from *Lebanon*, to *China*, (Me.) where his usefulness may be increased in two arduous and responsible professions.

DIED,

In this town, on the 12th inst. *GEORGE*, son of Capt. John Skillings, aged 16 years and 10 months.

In Westbrook, on the 9th inst. *MR. JAMES PORTERFIELD*, aged 48, of a lingering consumption; leaving a virtuous wife, two dutiful children, and many other relatives and friends, to lament his death.

In Salisbury, (Mass.) on the 6th inst. *MRS. HANNAH MORRILL*, relict of Capt. Jonathan Morrill, whose death we recorded, not a year since, aged 62.—Another of "the excellent of the earth," is no more! It would be impossible to speak too highly in commendation of this remarkable woman. Her amiableness, industry and moral virtues were extensively acknowledged and admired; yea, columns might be written in delineation of her good character. But we have room only to offer this brief and feeble tribute to her memory. During an illness of about *eleven years*, the last of which was extremely painful, her composure and resignation of mind were unexampled. With a hope in immortality, and full of glory, she was prepared to "depart in peace," commending her affectionate children and other dear friends to the care and protection of a merciful Providence.

In Swansey, (N. H.) on the 14th of July, *FARNUM FISH*, Esq. aged 51. It is extremely unpleasant and painful, even at this late hour, to record the death of this kind husband, affectionate parent, obliging neighbor, amiable man, good citizen and excellent magistrate. Not only the immediate circle of relatives and friends, but all the inhabitants of Swansey and its vicinity, will deplore the loss of the worthy and highly esteemed *Capt. Fish*. May his kindred and connexions be divinely supported, comforted and blessed, under the conviction, that he has exchanged *this*, for a happier state of existence.

Insatiate Death! thine arrows fly
And bring our kindred to the ground!
The Widow's tear—the Orphan's sigh,
Salute their num'rous friends around.

But lo! a voice from heaven is heard—
Or bursts in thunder from the grave;
It brings good tidings from the Lord,—
Death to destroy, but man to save.

Tho' dust return to dust again,
The spirit wings its flight above,
With God and Christ to live and reign,
'Mid endless scenes of peace and love.

In Hebron, *GENET*, son of Mr. Henry Holbrook, aged 3 years and 9 months; a most active, lovely and promising child.

Farewell! thou precious child! farewell!
Thy countless charms we see no more;
Our heartfelt pains no tongue can tell,
While we thine early death deplore.

But why, alas! should Parents mourn,
Since God hath call'd our Son away,
From earthly scenes where troubles frown,
To yonder world of cloudless day?

Oh! let us now our grief suppress,
And calmly bow to Heaven's decree;
For Jesus will our children bless
With Joys, to all Eternity!

Communicated.

POETRY.

ON THE DEATH OF A YOUNG LADY.

"There was a flow'r of beauteous birth
Of lavished charms and chasten'd die,
It smiled upon the lap of earth,
And caught the gaze of every eye.

"The vernal breeze, whose steps is seen
Imprinted in the early dew,
Ne'er brush'd a flower of brighter beam,
Or nursed a bud of lovelier hue!

"It blossom'd not in dreary wild,
In darksome glen or desert bow'r,
But grew like Flora's favorite child,
In sun-beam soft, and fragrant show'r.

"The graces lov'd with chasten'd light,
To flush its pure celestial gloom,
And all its blossoms were so bright,
It seem'd not form'd to die so soon.

"Youth round the flow'ret ere it fell,
In armor bright was seen to stray,
And beauty said, her magic spell
Should keep its perfume from decay.

"The parent-stalk from which it sprung,
Transported as its halo spread,
In holy umbrage o'er it hung,
And tears of heav'n-born rapture shed,

"Yet fragile flow'r! thy blossom bright,
Though guarded by a magic spell,
Like a sweet beam of evening light,
In lonely hour of tempest fell.

"The death blast of the winter air,
The cold frost and the night-wind came
They nipt the beauty once so fair!—
It shall not bloom on earth again!"

THE SABBATH.

"Still be rever'd the sacred hours of rest,
And be the Sabbath day forever blest!
Whether man labors with the utmost toil,
Manures the field or turns the faithful soil;
Whether he guides the harrow or the helm,
Rules o'er a district, or conducts a realm;
One day in seven is to rest assign'd,
And praise to Him who gave the human mind.
Then let each heart adore the God of truth,
Let age respect Him! and revere Him youth!
Let Sons of Freedom bow to him alone!
And let all nature his dominion own."

The public worship of God on the Sabbath is calculated to have a beneficial effect on the morals of a people. In public prayer the nature of God is acknowledged—His perfections, and the obligations we are under. Sin is renounced. We pray for repentance and pardon, and acknowledge it our duty to live soberly, righteously and godly. The heart is impressed with serious sentiments, and good resolutions are formed.—Songs of praise are intended to heighten devotion—to raise our thoughts of God's majesty, and to express a sense of our thankfulness for benefits received. In songs of praise, music and poetry unite their charms, to warm the heart with a sense of divine love, and to raise our affections to the Great Object of ado-

ration—Religious discourses properly conducted, tend to repress vice, to encourage virtue, and to make us wiser and better; thus the labors of public teachers coincide with the just design of civil policy. Public worship, in connection With the Christian Sabbath, promotes moral instructions and social refinement. Where they are attended to, mark their happy effects.—You behold decency, civilization of manners, sobriety, industry, good order and patriotism.—They form an habitual rectitude of character, and make men refined, humane and rational beings. Where they are not observed, you behold the contrary—idleness, intemperance, prodigality, brutality, and impatience of every kind of restraint.—In the solemn assemblies on the Sabbath, how many are there who weekly receive that useful instruction which guides their feet into the paths of duty; which makes them receive the necessary labors of life with cheerfulness, which supports them under affliction, and arms them with courage to meet death?

"One day amidst the place
Where Jesus is within,
Is better than ten thousand days
Of pleasure and of sin."

READER, LOOK AT THIS.

"EPISCOPAL ROTUNDITY. The Bishop of Durham, (Dr. Barrington,) who died lately in England, in his 92d year, had been Bishop for nearly fifty years, and is supposed to have received not much less than *one million sterling*, (4,500,000 dollars) from his See. What a shearing of the sheep, that one man might be plentifully provided for and kept warm." *Niles' Register.*

In the above may be seen one of the blessings of a combination between Church and State. Here is a fat Bishop pocketing *four and a half million of dollars*, all wrung, for tithes, from the hard earnings of the poor, whose spiritual welfare he professes to watch over, while many of the miserable beings around him, from whom he had drawn the last shilling, to pamper his appetites, were suffering for want of a morsel of food! Is this Christianity? Are such the purposes to which our religion is prostituted? Alas! lamentable as it is, every day's observation convinces us it is but too true.

Microscope.

THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER

Is published every other Saturday, at ONE DOLLAR per annum, in advance. Persons who forward to the Editor five dollars, for new subscribers, shall be entitled to ONE Volume gratis.

RUSSELL STREETER, Editor and Proprietor.